

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings for failing to comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include reference designators not mentioned in the written description of the application. In particular, the Examiner indicated that reference designators S1, S2, V_{ss}, U1, U2, R6, R7, and R8 are indicated on Figure 4A however are not mentioned in the written description. The Examiner also requested the Applicant's assistance correcting any further similar discrepancies. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for noting these discrepancies and hereby amends the specification to include reference to these elements of the invention illustrated in the drawings. The Applicant further notes that the designator R3 also indicated by Rj was lacking from the written description and is added by this paper.

The Examiner also objected to the discrepancy on page 18, line 8, between the "matching" state being referred to by reference designator 252 whereas in the corresponding drawing, Figure 5B, this state is labeled as reference designator 256 and an "await control signal" state is labeled as 252. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for noting this discrepancy and hereby amends the specification to correctly identify the matching state with the reference designator 256. The Applicant thus believes that the drawings and written description now do comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5).

The Examiner also rejected Claims 4-7 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, regarding Claim 4 the Examiner notes that the limitation of "the replacement stereo" lacks sufficient antecedent basis for the limitation as similar phrasing was previously introduced as "a replacement stereo receiver". The Applicant thanks the Examiner for noting this discrepancy and hereby amends Claim 4 to refer to the previously introduced limitation of "replacement stereo receiver". The Applicant believes that Claim 4 and the claims depending therefrom, i.e. Claims 5-7, now do comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner also indicated that in Claim 7 the phrase "such as" renders the claim indefinite. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for noting this discrepancy and hereby strikes the phrase "such as" including the subject "turning on a light".

Further regarding Claim 17 the Examiner indicates that the limitation of "a local control signal from an existing local stereo control button positioned within the vehicle" conflicts with

Appl. No. : 09/552,981
Filed : April 21, 2000

the limitation of the parent claim of "the at least one remote signal from a person in the vehicle" having differing scope thereby rendering the limitations indefinite. The Applicant again thanks the Examiner for noting this discrepancy and notes that claim 17 is cancelled by this paper, however the Applicant has made amendments to the base claim 15 as discussed in greater detail below in such a manner as the Applicant believes complies with the requirements 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner also rejected Claims 1, 8, 15, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over the Applicant's admitted prior art. In particular, the Examiner notes that the Applicant discloses in the subject application that replacement stereo receivers having an integral or built in voice command capability are known. Thus, the Applicant believes that it would be understood that the "replacement stereo receiver" indicated in the rejected claims refers to a replacement stereo receiver lacking such capability, however hereby amends Claim 1 to recite the limitation of "to a replacement stereo receiver lacking voice command capability" and makes similar amendments to Claims 8, 15, and 16 to more clearly indicate that the claimed invention applies to after market replacement stereo receivers lacking an inherent or built in voice command capability and that the claimed invention is neither anticipated nor obvious under the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) or § 103(a) respectively over the admitted prior art.

The Examiner also rejected Claims 2-7, 9-14, and 19-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Bush et al (US 6,397,186) hereafter referred to as Bush. The Applicant has carefully reviewed the Bush reference and notes that Bush teaches a system for providing voice controlled or voice actuated control of a plurality of independent electronic devices, such as VCRs, televisions, stereo receivers, and the like, such as in a home or office environment. Bush teaches that the voice commands may be implemented in either a speaker-dependent or a speaker-independent manner according to the specific preferences of a particular application. Bush also teaches that sublibraries of a larger universal library of recognized voice commands may be implemented to improve the speed and accuracy of the voice command analysis to improve accuracy and throughput speed of the Bush system. Bush teaches the desirability of such a system by eliminating the need for tactile actuation of user controls while using the Bush system so as to provide a truly hands free remote control capability for the plurality of electronic devices in communication with the Bush system.

The Applicant respectfully notes that Bush specifically teaches the undesirability of tactile actuation of user controls including the likelihood or misplacement or loss of a remote control unit, the difficulty with operating these controls faced by people of limited physical mobility or vision, and the preclusion from performing other hands on tasks while actuating tactilely operated user controls (*c.f.* Column 1, Lines 25-41). The Applicant also notes as discussed in the prior art of the subject application that as after market replacement stereo receivers having voice command capability are known, even if the teachings of Bush were combined with this prior art, the resultant would be a replacement stereo receiver in combination with the Bush device providing solely voice command control of the replacement stereo receiver. The difficulties and limitations of interfacing the replacement stereo receiver to the original equipment local stereo control buttons, for example placed on or adjacent the steering wheel would remain. In fact, the Applicant notes that Bush specifically teaches away from interfacing tactilely operated user controls to electronic devices. Thus, the Applicant believes that the claimed invention of "a voice control interface device that receives at least one voice command and at least one command from one or more local stereo control buttons positioned within a vehicle and produces at least one output signal to a replacement stereo receiver lacking voice command capability and installed in the vehicle to replace an originally installed stereo receiver so that either of the at least one voice command or the local stereo control button command can be used to control the operation of the replacement stereo receiver" (Claim 1 as currently amended) as well as the claims depending therefrom, i.e. Claims 2-7, are patentable under the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combined teachings of the admitted prior art and Bush. The Applicant also notes that the other base Claims 8 and 15 are similarly amended by this paper to more clearly indicate that the claimed invention is operable with both voice commands and user actuation of local stereo control buttons, such as provided by the original equipment manufacturer on or adjacent the steering wheel, handle bars, etc. and that these claimed aspects of the Applicant's invention are not obvious under the combined teachings of the prior art and Bush.

The Examiner also rejected Claims 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of the Applicant's admitted prior art as previously discussed in the Action and further in view of Kirson et al (US 6,114,970). The Applicant has carefully reviewed the Kirson et al reference and notes that Kirson teaches providing a globally unique device

Appl. No. : 09/552,981
Filed : April 21, 2000

identifier to uniquely identify a new device that is added to an existing architecture. Kirson teaches that in various applications a vehicle identification number (VIN) or a telephone number including country and area codes may be used as a basis for developing a unique device identifier. The Applicant respectfully notes however that Kirson et al fails to teach actually providing an interface to an after market stereo receiver that would allow a user to control the operation of the replacement stereo receiver either with spoken voice commands or user actuation of local stereo control buttons and that, as discussed above, the Applicant believes that the base Claim 15 is patentable over the teachings of the admitted prior art and Kirson and that Claim 18 properly further defines the limitations of the base Claim 15 and that as the base claim is not obvious under the combined teachings of the admitted prior art and Kirson that the dependent Claim 18 is also patentable. The Applicant notes that Claim 17 is cancelled by this paper.

Appl. No. : 09/552,981
Filed : April 21, 2000

SUMMARY

From the foregoing, the Applicant believes that the subject application now complies with the drawing and description requirements of 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5). The Applicant believes that the claimed invention also complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Applicant also believes that the claimed invention is patentable under the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) over the admitted prior art and also under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combined teachings of the admitted prior art and the Bush and Kirson references taken either independently or in any combination. Thus, the Applicant believes that the application as currently amended is now in a condition ready for allowance and respectfully requests prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability. The Applicant believes that this paper is fully responsive to the objections and rejections made by the Examiner in the Office Action, however should there remain any further impediment to the allowance of this application that might be resolved by telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the indicated telephone number.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 5/21/04

By: 

James W. Ausley
Registration No. 49,076
Agent of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(909) 781-9231